

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the Name Allah, the Lord of the Universe.

Praise be Allah, Almighty, the lord of the universe, by his guidance and blessings, the writer at last completed this academic requirement. Then, the writer address Prophet Muhammad (peace be Upon Him) on his strengthened doctrines in writer wishes to express his sincere thanks for them.

They are:

1. Prof. Dr. Nazir, the Rector of State Islamic University SUSKA RIAU.
2. Dr. Hj. Helmiati, M. Ag as a Dean of Teacher's Training Faculty Education.
3. Dr. Hj. Zulhidah, M. Pd as chief of English Department of State Islamic University.
4. Kurnia Budiyantri, M. Pd. The writer's supervisor for his guide and support for complication of this paper.
5. Drs. M. Syafii S, M. Pd who has supported and helped the writer in completion this paper.
6. The Writer's Father Drs.Jamburi and mother Fitri Yanasari, M.Pd who have supported the Writer in finishing this thesis.
7. The Writer's brothers, they are: Hafizh Alhaq, Faturrahman and Muhammad Asyraf. And also the Writer's sister, she is Lutfiaturrohman. Who always support me as your oldest brother.
8. Zetti Herawati, S. Pd as the Headmaster of State Junior High School 11 Dumai.
9. Meini Arfida, S. Pd as the Teacher of English subject in State Junior High School 11 Dumai.

10. All students of the Second year of State Junior High School 11 Dumai for their involvement in sitting for the Teaching and Learning Process.

11. My bebh Dona Rahmawati who has supported me in finishing this paper.

10. Lastly, I would like to express appreciation to my beloved friends in E class 2008 Academic year, they are: Acid, Abel, Ajo Iwan, Ana, Bundo Ratna, Cece, Dani, Febri, Iis, Imel, Ina, Indra, Amek Halim, Ajo Sap, Manil, Mimi, Mbak Mira, Aan, Nova, Novi, Ocu Dinar, Rizka, Olva, Septi, Riani, Dajeng Eel, and Niza.

The writer admits that thesis is still far from being perfect. Therefore, constructive advices and critics from the reader will be much appreciated.

May Allah Bless the all, Amin.

Pekanbaru, March 13th 2012

Writer

Rauf Tetuko Barruansyah

ABSTRAK

Rauf Tetuko Barruansyah (2012). Pengaruh Penggunaan Strategi the Window Notes terhadap Minat Baca Siswa pada Kelas Dua SMP Negeri 11 Dumai.

Berdasarkan studi pendahuluan penulis, ditemukan bahwa, beberapa siswa tidak memiliki minat terhadap bahan bacaan bahasa Inggris. Masalah ini disebabkan oleh beberapa faktor. Misalnya, sebagian siswa malas untuk membaca bahan bacaan yang diberikan dan sebagian siswa malas mengerjakan latihan yang diberikan oleh guru. Jadi, penulis tertarik mengadakan penelitian tentang masalah tersebut.

Penelitian diadakan di SMP Negeri 11 Dumai. Subjek dari penelitian ini adalah siswa tahu kedua SMP Negeri 11 Dumai, dan objek dari penelitian ini adalah pengaruh dari the Window Notes strategi. Adapun jenis penelitiannya adalah *Quasi-experiment*.

Populasi dari penelitian ini adalah seluruh siswa taun kedua di SMP Negeri 11 Dumai. Keseluruhan dari jumlah populasi adalah 108 siswa. Dikarenakan jumlah populasi sangat banyak, peneliti menggunakan Cluster random sampling yang hanya mengambil dua kelas sampel; VIII.1 yang terdiri dari 36 siswa sebagai kelompok eksperimen, dan VIII.2 yang terdiri dari 36 siswa sebagai kelompok kontrol. Jadi, jumlah sampel dari dua kelas tersebut adalah 72 siswa. Untuk data analisisnya, peneliti menggunakan Anova melalui SPSS.

Setelah data dianalisis, peneliti menemukan pengaruh signifikan dari the Window Notes strategi terhadap minat membaca siswa tahun kedua SMP Negeri 11 Dumai, dimana F_{hitung} adalah 14.521 lebih tinggi daripada $F_{0,05} = 4.00$. Maka null hypothesis (H_0) ditolak, dan alternative hypothesis (H_a) diterima.

LIST OF CONTENTS

SUPERVISOR APPROVAL.....	i
EXAMINER APPROVAL.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xii
CHAPTER I THE INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. The Background.....	1
B. The Definition of the Term.....	3
C. The Problem.....	5
1. The Identification of the Problem.....	5
2. The Limitation of the Problem.....	5
3. The Formulation of the Problem.....	6
D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research.....	6
1. The Objective of the Research.....	6
2. The Significance of the Reseach.....	7
CHAPTER II REVIEWING OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	8
A. Review of Related Theory.....	8
1. The Nature of Reading.....	8
2. The Nature of Interest.....	10
3. Reading Interest.....	12
4. The Window Notes strategy.....	14
5. Teaching Reading in Control Class.....	20
B. Review of Related findings.....	21
C. Operational Concept.....	22
D. The Assumption and Hypothesis.....	24
1. The Assumption.....	24
2. The Hypothesis.....	24
CHAPTER III THE RESEARCH METHOD.....	25
A. Research Design.....	25
B. The Time and the Location of the Research.....	26
C. The Subject and the Object of the Research.....	26
D. The Population and the Sample of the Research.....	27
E. The Technique of Collecting Data.....	28
F. The Technique of Data Analysis.....	28
CHAPTER IV DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS....	30
A. Data Description.....	30
B. Data Presentation.....	30
The Students' Reading Interest.....	31
C. Data Analysis.....	71
1. The Students' Reading Interest score.....	71
2. Data Analysis of Regression Formula.....	77

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION.....	79
A. Conclusion.....	80
B. Suggestion.....	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDICES	

LIST OF THE TABLES

Table III.1	Non Equivalent Control Group Design.....	26
Table III.2	The Population of the Students.....	27
Table IV.1	Students' Attendance in Learning English.....	31
Table IV.2	Students' Discipline when entering to the class.....	33
Table IV.3	Students' activity during teaching and learning process.....	35
Table IV.4	Students' attitude in learning English.....	37
Table IV.5	Students' purpose in visiting school library.....	39
Table IV.6	Students' purpose in visiting public Library.....	41
Table IV.7	Students' activity when they have a leisure time.....	43
Table IV.8	Students' activity if they have a leisure time.....	45
Table IV.9	Students' attitude in the class.....	47
Table IV.10	Students' effort in using Dictionary.....	49
Table IV.11	Students' attention in the class.....	51
Table IV.12	Students' attention when the teacher explains the reading material.....	53
Table IV.13	Students' interest to English lesson book.....	55
Table IV.14	Students' interest to English story books.....	57
Table IV.15	Students' interest to English articles.....	59
Table IV.16	Students' interest to English newspaper.....	61
Table IV.17	Students' honestly in doing exercise.....	63
Table IV.18	Students' effort in doing exercise.....	65
Table IV.19	Students' effort in doing their English homework.....	67

Table IV.20	Students' effort in finish their exercise on time.....	69
Table IV.21	The Classification of students' Reading interest score...	71
Table IV.22	Summary of pre questionnaire on experiment class.....	72
Table IV.23	Summary of post questionnaire on experiment class.....	73
Table IV.24	Summary of pre questionnaire on control class.....	74
Table IV.25	Summary of post questionnaire on control class.....	75
Table IV.26	The Students' reading interest Score in experiment and control class.....	76
Table IV.27	Descriptive statistics.....	77
Table IV.28	Correlation.....	78
Table IV.29	Variable Entered/Removed.....	78
Table IV.30	Model Summary.....	78
Table IV.31	Anova ^b	79

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Problem

Reading interest is a situation when the students are interested in reading, but it can become a problem for students, because many of the students are not interested in reading. One of the capabilities in reading is interest. Interest is an aspect which is important to do our reading, because if students are not interested in reading, automatically it is difficult for them to understand what reading text is talking about. Interest is an attitude which is brought by students to do their learning process, it means that interest is influential in learning. It is supported by Eidswick, he explained that interest has a strong influence on learning¹

Based on School Based Curriculum (KTSP), reading must be provided as one of the skills in mastering English that it should be taught and learned. In state Junior high school 11 Dumai, School Based curriculum (KTSP) is used in learning process. Based on the syllabus of state Junior high school 11 Dumai, as the basic stated for second grade is that students should be able to read the text book loudly and clearly.²

Based on writer's observation on 24th February 2011 at state Junior high school 11 Dumai, reading was taught by conventional technique. The students were given reading materials and they answered the questions, then, teacher asked them to collect their papers and the teacher gave the correct answers to the students. This school has a Library and Public Library which came twice a week by using a

¹John Eidswick. The Influence of interest on reading. (www.eric.ed.gov, January, 2009).p.1

²Meini Arfida. Silabus SMPN 11 Dumai 2010-2011. (Dumai: Unpublished)

car. Both of the Libraries have many English reading material, like English lesson books, English story books, and also some English newspapers. In fact, some of the students were not interested in the reading material, they did not pay more attention to reading material. It can be seen from the following phenomena:

- a. Some of the students are lazy to read the reading books.
- b. Some of the students do not pay more attention when the reading material is given.
- c. Some of the students are lazy to do their reading assignment.
- d. Some of the students come late to the class when the learning reading process begins.

To accomplish students' need in reading interest, there is a strategy that can help students to improve their reading interest which is called the Window Notes strategy. Silver explains that student get bored when what they are learning does not relate to their lives. The Window Notes strategy allows students to share their opinion, experiences, and suggestion, related to their lives. The Window notes challenge students to go beyond the basic facts of what they are learning and push further, into self discovery. Second, the Window Notes provides teacher with deep insight into how each student's mind works³.

Therefore, the writer is interested to in carrying out the research, entitled:

**THE EFFECT OF USING THE WINDOW NOTES STRATEGY
TOWARD READING INTEREST OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS
AT STATE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 11 DUMAI.**

³Harvey F Silver, Richard W Strong, and Matthew J Perini. 2007.*The Strategic Teacher:Selecting the Right Research-Based Strategy for Every Lesson*.Virginia: ASCD. p. 211

B. The Definition of the Term

1. The Window Notes strategy

The Window Notes strategy is one of strategies which can be used in order to improve students' interest in reading. This strategy is made to improve students' interest by minimizing students' boredom in reading. Strong and Silver developed the Window Notes strategy by applying this research on boredom specifically to act of taking notes. The idea behind the strategy is simple: Because notes are so critical to student success, we need to stop treating them as repetitive and routine tasks. If we expect students to be actively engaged in collecting and recording their ideas, then we need a strategy that teaches students how to make notes rather than take notes. This strategy treats notes as deep and dynamic form of thinking, as personal and creative acts.⁴

2. Reading

Reading perceives a written text in order to understand its contents. It can be done silently.⁵ In this case, reading means that a process to get the information from the text. It can be gotten if they are interested in reading.

3. Interest

Interest is statement of desire to learn or to know about somebody or something, curiosity concerned with felling, showed and express.⁶ In this case, interest is very important to understand the text well.

⁴Silver.et al. Op.cit.p.6

⁵Jack C Richards.1992. *Longman Dictionary of Language and Applied Linguistics*.Malaysia: Longman Group Uk Limited. p. 306

⁵Jack C Richards. 1992. *Longman Dictionary of Language and Applied Linguistics*.Malaysia: Longman Group Uk Limited. 1992. p. 65

⁶Ibid. p.306

4. Effect

Change that sb/sth causes in sb/sth else.⁷In this case, the effect is important to measure how much students' reading interest changed.

C. The Problem

1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the explanation above, the writer identifies the problems as follows:

- a. Why are some of the students lazy to read the reading books?
- b. Why do not some of the students more attention when the reading material is given?
- c. Why are some of the students lazy to do their reading assignment?
- d. Why do some of the students come late to the class when the learning reading process begins?

2.The Limitation of the problem

Based on the Identification of the problem above, thus, the problems of the research are limited on:

- a. Students' reading interest at state Junior High School 11 Dumai by using the Window Notes strategy.
- b. Students' reading interest at State Junior High School 11 Dumai by using conventional strategy.

⁷Ibid.p.138

- c. The effect of using the Window Notes strategy toward reading interest at the second year students at State Junior High School 11 Dumai.

3. The Formulation of the problem

The problem of this research will be formulated in the following questions:

- a. How is the students' reading interest which is taught by using conventional strategy?
- b. How is the students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy?
- c. Is there any significant effect of students' reading interest between those who are taught by using the Window Notes strategy and those who are not?

D. The Objectives and the Significance of the Research

1. The Objectives of the Research

- a. To find out students' reading interest which is taught by using conventional strategy.
- b. To find out students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy.
- c. To find out the significant effect of students' reading interest between those who are taught by using the Window Notes strategy and those who are not.

2. The Significance of the Research

The research activity is significantly carried out for the following needs. They are:

- a. To give some information to the teacher and school about the effect of using the Window Notes strategy toward students' reading interest.
- b. To give some contribution to the students in order to improve students' reading interest.
- c. To enhance the writer's knowledge about teaching reading by using the Window Notes strategy.
- d. To fulfill one of the requirements to finish the writer's study in English Education Department of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau .

CHAPTER II

REVIEWING OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. Review of Related Theory

1. The Nature of Reading

Reading is a way to get information. Almost every aspect in our life is covered by reading. Almost every day we read books, magazines, advertisements, etc. To get information from a book, we need to comprehend it well. Anderson adds that reading is a fluent process of readers combining information from a text and their own background knowledge to build meaning. It is supported by Murcia, she explains that reading is to learn which involves complex thinking skills which can help them to get the meaning on the text.¹ The writer concludes that reading is an activity which is done by the reader to get information and build the information from the text.

According to KalayoHasibuan, reading is an activity with a purpose.² Beatrice explains that reading for pleasure can improve vocabulary, increase reading speed, improve reading comprehension, give us a chance to gain more knowledge.³ From the explanation above the writer concludes that reading is an activity with a purpose and get information or knowledge from the text. And it can be easier if doing it as a pleasant activity.

¹Celce Murcia and Mariane.1991.*Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language*. Los Angeles:University of California. p.200

²Kalayo Hasibuan.2007.*Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press. p.114

³Beatrice S Mikulecky.1996. *More reading power*. New York:Wesley publishing company.p.7

According to McWhorter, there are two factors which influence students' reading ability:⁴

1. Internal Factors

a. Background knowledge

The amount of knowledge we have about a topic influence how easily and how fast we will be able to read about it.

b. Physical and mental state

How we feel a cold, how much sleep we have had, and whether we are happy or relaxed.

c. Interest Level

Most of the people have little difficult understanding and remembering material if the subject is highly interesting. So, the students must be interested in their reading.

d. Reading skill

Our ability to comprehend directly influences how well and how fast we are able to read a given page and our vocabulary is also an important factor.

2. External Factor

It means, factors which comes from outside the students, like reading facility, reading purpose, parent motivation, economic background, reading habit, teacher, and environment.

2. The Nature of Interest

⁴Kathleen T McWhorter. 1992. *Efficient and Flexible Reading*. New York:Niagara Country Community College, Hoper Collong publisher. p. 10

Interest is important to do all of our activities, because if we are not interested in doing something, automatically our activity can be failed. In other words, interest is very important role in teaching learning process.⁵ Loretta adds that interest is an important factor which should be taken into consideration when choosing materials for reading instruction. It is supported by William, he explains that stimulating interest in reading is an important part of most basal lessons, and teachers are provided with several suggestions to achieve this purpose.⁶ Paul explains that interest is adaptive because it motivates people to develop diverse experiences that can be helpful when unforeseen events occur.⁷

From the explanation above the writer concludes that we have to stimulate our interest in reading in order to get what the reading text is talking about clearly and it can be done if we relate our reading activity and our experience.

Penny explains one the ways of arousing interest in task is Personalization. Personalization is explained that learners are more likely to be interested in tasks that have to do with themselves: their own or each other's opinions, tastes, experiences, suggestions. It means that one of the ways to make the students interested in reading is we use a strategy which is done by relating students' experiences, opinion, tastes, suggestions, so the Window Notes strategy can be used to stimulate students' reading interest.

⁵Abu Ahmadi. 1987. *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia. p. 107

⁶William H. Rupley. 1976. *The reading Teacher*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum. p. 118

⁷Paul J. Silvia. 2006. *Exploring the Psychology of Interest*. London: Oxford New York. p.

There are perspectives of interest which can be divided into three parts, they are:⁸

1. Personal interest

Personal interest is usually assumed to be direct toward some specific activities or topics.

2. Situational interest

It is activated as a function of interestingness of the context.

3. Interest as Psychological state

The psychological state of being interested in the task or activity.

3. Reading Interest

Reading interest is a strong attention and happiness when they read a reading material.⁹ Sinambela in Rahayu explained reading interest is a condition when people can feel happy in reading, and also know the advantages of reading.¹⁰

From the explanation above, the writer concludes that reading interest is a condition when the people are happy in reading the materials and know if reading is an important activity to increase the people's knowledge.

Supriyono explained the purposes of reading interest:¹¹

1. Making reading as a students' habitual activity.

⁸Dale H Schunck, at all. 2008. *Motivation In Education*. New Jersey:Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall. p.213

⁹Tampubolon. 1993. *Mengembangkan Minat dan Kebiasaan Membaca pada Anak*. Bandung: Angkasa. p. 41

¹⁰Tampubolon. 2011. *Minat Baca Siswa*. Bandung: Angkasa. p. 12

¹¹ibid

2. Developing library services.
3. Making reading to increase students' knowledge.
4. The students have many of new information.
5. Increasing students' thinking ability
6. Spending their leisure time.

From the explanation above, the writer concludes that the purpose of reading interest is very important for the students. Because, when they are interested in reading, automatically they can get the new information, increase their knowledge, and also make reading as an joyful and habitual activity.

Supriyono also explains that teacher has an important role to increase students' reading interest. If the teacher is wrong in using method, it can make the students lazy in reading. The teacher who does not give opportunity to the students to discuss the topic in the class, it will make the learning process in the class boring because the students do not want to know the reading material clearly. But, if the teacher gives an opportunity for the students to discuss with their friends, it can make the students want to know the reading material clearly and they can get new information from the teacher and also from their friends. So, in order to make the students are interested in reading, we have to give an appropriate strategy.

Ainley and Hidi have considered the problem of timing related to interest questionnaires that has been widely used to measure interest. When ratings of interest are made after reading, participants are asked to remember what they felt back in time. As they have completed their reading at this point. Students'

recollections of how interest they found the text can be influenced by knowledge they gained from reading text.¹²Hidi says that to measure students' reading interest is very complex, because we may not see on their reading activity only, but, we have to relate it to their activity in the class when reading is taught.

Hidi explains the characteristics of the students who are interested in reading:¹³

- a. Students attend to the class in learning English.
- b. Students spend their time reading english book.
- c. Students are active in the classroom during learning reading process.
- d. Students like to read English reading material.
- e. Students do their reading task well.

4. The Window Notes strategy

The Window Notes strategy is one of the strategies which can be used in order to improve students' interest in reading. This strategy is made to improve students' interest by minimizing students' boredom in reading. The Window Notes strategy has grown out of the work of Richard Strong, Harvey Silver, and their colleagues. During their investigation into the causes of student boredom, Strong and his team found that boredom is rooted in the failure to engage natural student drives in school. Specifically, students withdraw from learning and become bored when the drives associated with mastering competencies, making

¹²Suzane Hidi. 2008. *Educational Psychology Review*. New York:Springer. p.201

¹³Ibid, p. 202

sense and meaning out of ideas, expressing the unique aspects of their personalities, and relating personally to learning are neglected in the classroom.¹⁴

Silver adds two benefits of the Window Notes strategy:¹⁵

First, the Window Notes strategy asks students what they think and lets them have their own opinions. The students get bored and are not interested when they are learning not related to their lives. The Window Notes strategy challenge students to go beyond the basic facts of what they are learning and push further, into self discovery. The Window Notes strategy shaped structure explicitly lays out what they need to share. It means that the Window Notes strategy can be used because it will relate between students' learning reading and their lives.

Second, the Window Notes strategy provides teachers with deep insight into how each student's mind works. By observing and discussing students' preferences for different kind of notes, teacher learns how to drive and learn, developed and least developed in their students.

Strong explains that the Window Notes strategy can help us to minimize students' boredom and strengthen students' interest in learning reading. The Window Notes strategy can be done to minimize weaknesses.

Based on the explanation above, the writer concludes that the Window Notes strategy is an appropriate strategy to improve students' interest in reading. Automatically, the Window Notes strategy can be used in this research.

Window Notes is a focusing and organizational strategy that students engage in during reading. As students read selected text, they are asked to focus their

¹⁴Silver et al. loc.cit. p. 210.

¹⁵Ibid.p.210

attention and organize their thoughts in four specific areas. During their reading, they react to text relating to:

1. Facts: Students take some facts from the text.
2. Questions: Students make some questions based on their own personal questions which can be made after they read the text.
3. Feeling: Students make statements which is felt by students, related to their experiences.
4. Ideas: Students make their ideas in some statements which come after they read the text and share their own opinion which is related to their lives.

Students use the Window Notes page to collect evidence and their response to facts, they believe that are big ideas, feelings they are drawn toward as they respond emotionally to what they are reading, or ideas that are key or central to understanding the text. At the same time, students develop questions that are unanswered during their reading.¹⁶

To make clear about this strategy, Silver explained the steps of the Window Notes strategy:¹⁷

1. Introduce and model Window Notes by showing students how you collect facts, questions, ideas, and feelings related to a particular topic or text.

¹⁶Harvey F Silver. 2007. *The Window Notes*. Virginia: ASCD. p. 120

¹⁷Silver et al. Op.cit. p. 211.

2. Ask students to divide a blank sheet of paper into a window-shaped organizer of four quadrants. Students should label the quadrants of *Fact, Questions, Ideas, and Feeling*.
3. Introduce the text or topic to be learned and ask students to read the text.
4. Ask students to fill their notes and invite students to share their notes with the class, and conduct a discussion on what students have learned about the content and about their personal preferences as note makers.
5. Give a task that requires students to use their notes.
6. Over time, teach students to use the strategy independently, as a way to help them break new learning up into meaningful sets of information and as a way to help them pay attention to the inner workings of their own minds.

Penny explains that one of the ways of arousing interest in task is Personalization. Personalization is explained that learners are more likely to be interested in tasks that have to do with them selves: their own or each other's opinion, tastes, experiences, suggestions.¹⁸ So, the Window Notes strategy can be used in order to improve students' interest in reading because by using the Window Notes strategy, the teacher asks students to share their opinion, experiences, tastes, and suggestion.

¹⁸Penny Ur. A course in Language Teaching:Practice and Theory. USA:Cambridge University Press. 2003,p. 281

To accomplish our need in using the Window Notes strategy, the writer will give a descriptive text and how to use the Window Notes strategy in reading text:

Example of reading text: (sources: Alice Savage)¹⁹

The Best Pizza in Town and Maybe the World

I have suffered a great deal because of a terrible addiction to pizza. Basically, I enjoy pizza too much. In fact, I enjoy it so much, i won't share it, not even with mother. People in my hometown of Cabimas, Venezuela, laugh at me and call me the Pizza King of Cabimas, but it is a name that I am proud of. I have eaten pizza in many places, and none is as good as the Pizza of Cabimas.

The best place to eat pizza is at papa's. Costumers have to wait in line to get a table but the wait is worth it. Once they are seated, pizza-lovers can choose from many varieties of pizza, such as pizza with shrimp and smoked oysters or pizza with pine nuts and garlic, but my favorite is the sausage and pepperoni. First of all, it is big. When the writer puts it down in front of me, I feel happy because I will get enough to eat. It smells of garlic, oil, and spices. And it looks delicious too. The sauce oozes out from under a layer of rich melted cheese, and I am in Heaven. I can eat two of these pizzas in one night, even though I know I will have a stomachache afterwards.

Now that I am in the United States, I am trying different kinds of pizza here. I have never seen so many different pizza restaurants! I want to try them one by one. So far, some of them are delicious, but I am convinced that the best pizza in the world is still Papa's restaurant a couple of blocks from the house where I grew up.

Based on the descriptive text above, the writer will model how to practice the Window Notes strategy:

FACTS	FELLINGS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• He (the writer of this story)likes pizza so much• The best place eat pizza is at Papa's• He is in United States now.• No place is like Papa's	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I'm very confused about him.• To me, he is pizza holic

¹⁹Alice savage and Patricia Mayer.*Effective Academic Writing*2. New York:Oxford University Press. 2005, p. 34

QUESTIONS	IDEAS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why did he move to United States? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He reminds me of my uncle Joko, uncle Joko likes Pecel and he eats it every morning.

5. Teaching Reading in Control Class

Control Class is one of the classes in Quasi Experimental research used to look at the different results from the Experimental class in applying a technique, strategy, and method of a research. This class was treated served by using the conventional technique, of course different rather than practice, optimizing emotional preparedness for learning.²⁰ The materials and the purpose of the learning were the same. The results obtained in both Experimental class and Control class were a consideration for writer to look at the successful or unsuccessful technique.

²⁰Richard. 2007. *Approach and Metods in Language Teaching a Description and Analysis*. London: Cambride University Press

There are four steps of using conventional strategy in Reading:

- a. The teacher asks students to read passage on the text.
- b. The teacher asks students to find out the meaning of difficult words.
- c. The teacher asks students to answer the questions based on the text.
- d. The teacher collects the students' assignment.

B. Review of Related Findings

1. A research from Jennifer L. Austin²¹

The present study assessed “the effects of guided notes on student responding and accuracy of recall of lecture material in an undergraduate psychology class using multi-element design”. Guided notes were administered for approximately half of the class sessions on a random schedule. Data were collected on the frequency of student responses and daily quizzes, administered to assess accuracy of recall of information presented in the lecture. Results indicated higher mean quiz scores and response frequencies during the guided notes condition. Social validity questionnaires administered to participants revealed satisfaction with results and procedures.

2. A research from Daniel H. Robinson(2008)²²

²¹Jennifer L. Austin.2009. *The Effectof GuidedNotes on StudentResponding and Accuracy*. Texas:University of Texas.

Daniel concluded a research which entitled “Increasing Text Comprehension and Graphic Note Taking Using a Partial Graphic Organizer”. He used random assignment. Also, the authors measured students' note-taking style (linear vs. graphic) at the beginning and end of the course. In all experiments, Graphic Organizer note taking increased. The increases were greatest when the authors presented the partial task in a computer environment with a timed, forced-choice task. Implications for using the partial Graphic Organizer task in the classroom, as well as future note-taking research directions are discussed.

In that research, Daniel measured students' note taking style, so in this research, the writer focuses on the effect of using the Window Notes toward students' reading interest.

C. Operational Concept

Syafi'i mentioned that all related theoretical frameworks can be operated in the operational concept.²³ In this operational concept, the writer would like to explain briefly about variable of the research itself. There are two variables that will be used. The first is the Window Notes strategy which refers to the teacher's strategy in teaching reading descriptive text (in experimental class) which is known as Independent variable or variable X. The second is students' reading interest which is known as Dependent variable or variable Y.

1. The Indicators of the Window Notes strategy are as follows²⁴:

²²Daniel H Robinson.2009. *Increasing Text Comprehension and Graphic Note Taking Using a Partial Graphic Organizer*.Texas:University of Texas.

²³M. Syafii S.2007. *From Paragraph to Research Report: A Writing of English for Academic Purposes*.Pekanbaru:LBSI.p. 122

²⁴Harvey et al.Op.cit. p. 211

- a. The teacher introduces and models Window Notes by showing students how teacher collects facts, questions, ideas, and feelings related to a particular topic or text.
 - b. The teacher asks students to divide a blank sheet of paper into a window-shaped organizer of four quadrant. Students should label the quadrants *facts, questions, ideas, and feelings*.
 - c. The teacher introduces the text to be learned and asks students to read the text.
 - d. The teacher asks students to fill their notes and invites students to share their notes to the class.
 - e. The teacher gives a task that requires students to use their notes.
2. The indicators of reading interest are as follows:²⁵
 - a. Students attend to the class in learning English.
 - b. Students spend their time reading english book.
 - c. Students are active in the class during learning reading process well.
 - d. Students like to read english reading material.
 - e. Students do their reading task well.

D. Assumption and Hypotheses

1. Assumption

²⁵Suzane Hidi. Op.cit,p. 202

In this research, the writer assumes that (a) Students have different interest in reading (b) The better the Window Notes strategy is applied in teaching or learning reading, the better students' reading interest.

2. Hypotheses

- a. H_0 : There is no significant effect of students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy of the second year students at state Junior High School 11 Dumai.
- b. H_a : There is a significant effect of students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy of the second year students at state Junior High School 11 Dumai.

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH METHOD

A. The Research Design

This research consists of two variables, they are Independent variable that refers to the use the Window Notes strategy and Dependent variable refers to reading interest. In conducting the research, two classes of the second year students were involved. The first class was an experimental class and the second class was a control class. An experimental class was taught by using the Window Notes strategy, meanwhile control class was not taught by using the Window Notes strategy.

This design of this research was Quasi Experimental design, which used nonequivalent control group design. Furthermore, Cresswell says that the writer can use intact group the experimental and control treatments, give a pre-questionnaire to both of groups, hold experimental treatment activities with the experimental group only, after that give a post-questionnaire to assess the effect between two groups.¹

In working with such intact nonequivalent groups, the nonequivalent control group design, shown below.²

Table III.1
Nonequivalent Control Group Design

¹John W Creswell.2008. *Educational Research:Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Merrill Prantice Hall.p. 299

²Bruce W Tuckman. 1999. *Educational Research: fifth edition*. New York:Harcourt brace college publisher.p.141

Group	Pre-Questionnaire	Treatment	Post-Questionnaire
Experiment	01	X	03
Control	02		04

Where:

O = Questionnaire

X = treatment by using the Window Notes strategy

B. The Time and the Location of the Research

This research was conducted at State Junior High School 11 Dumai. The time of conducting research activities was for three months, started from September 27th 2011 until November 15th 2011.

C. The Subject and the Object of the Research

The subject of the research was the second year students of State Junior High School 11 Dumai 2010/2011. The object of the research was the effect using the Window Notes strategy toward students' reading interest.

D. The Population and the Sample of the Research

The population in this research was the second year students at State Junior High School 11 Dumai. They were consisting of three classes, total number of students was 108 and each class was 36 students. Based on the limitation of the research, the writer took only two classes of the population. The writer used Cluster random sampling , it was done by selecting group (not individual) because all members of selected group had similar characteristics.³ After doing that, the writer took VIII 1 as a experimental class and VIII 2 as a control class.

Table III.2

³L.R Gay and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, inc. p. 129

The Population of the second year students of State Junior High School 11

Dumai

No	Class	Population		Total
		Male	Female	
1	VIII 1	24	12	36
2	VIII 2	22	14	36
3	VIII 3	21	15	36

E. The Technique of Collecting Data

In order to get the data were needed in this research, the writer used technique as follows:

Questionnaire

The data were gotten from writer's question. The questionnaire was a number of the questions from the respondents dealing with students' interest in reading. In collecting the data the writer used Likert Scale. The Experiment class and Control class was given pre-questionnaire, then, only Experiment class was given the treatment by using the Window Notes strategy about 8 times. After giving the treatment about 8 times on Experiment class, the Experiment class and Control class was given post-questionnaire by using the same questions. The questions in the questionnaire consist of 20 questions, it was made based on the indicators of reading interest. The total number of the indicators of students' reading interest is 5, and each of them have 4 questions in the questionnaire.

F. The technique of Data Analysis

In order to know the significant effect of using the Window Notes strategy toward reading interest, the writer used scores of pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire. The data was analyzed by using regression formula through using SPSS 17 version.

The $F_{\text{calculated}}$ is obtained by considering variable of df as follows:

$$df = N - \text{independent variable} - 1$$

N = Number of cases level chosen in analyzing the score $F_{\text{calculated}}$ through using SPSS 17 version is 5% or 0.05.

Statistically the hypotheses are:

$$H_a: F_{\text{calculated}} > F_{0.05}$$

$$H_0: F_{\text{calculated}} < F_{0.05}$$

H_a is accepted if $F_{\text{calculated}} > F_{0.05}$ or there is a significant effect of students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy of the the second year students at state Junior High School 11 Dumai.

H_0 is accepted if $F_{\text{calculated}} < F_{0.05}$ or there is no significant effect of students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy of the the second year students at state Junior High School 11 Dumai.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

A. Data Description

The purpose of this research was to obtain the data of students' reading interest taught by using the Window Notes strategy and taught by using conventional strategy, and also the significant effect of students' reading interest taught by using the Window Notes strategy. The research procedures of this research are as follows:

1. The writer gave pre-questionnaire to experimental class and control class.
2. The writer gave treatments for eight meetings by using the Window Notes strategy to experimental class and using conventional strategy to control class.
3. The writer gave post-questionnaire to experimental class and control class to know the effect of using the Window Notes strategy toward students' reading interest.

B. Data Presentation

This research was to find out the effect of using the Window Notes strategy toward reading interest at the second year students at State Junior High School Dumai. Observation and questionnaire were used to obtain the required data. The observation was used to gather the information about the effect of using the Window Notes strategy in class room activities and questionnaire was used to gather the information about student's reading interest.

The data of students' reading interest

The table below shows some questionnaires of students' reading interest

TableIV.1**Students' attendance in learning English****THE STUDENTS COME TO THE CLASS EVERY ENGLISH CLASS**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL				CONTROL			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.7%	2	5.5%	2	5.5%	2	5.5%
2	Often	25	69.4%	19	52.7%	23	63.8%	18	50%
3	Sometimes	8	22.2%	15	41.6%	11	30.5%	16	44.4%
4	Seldom	2	5.5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
5	Never	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always come to the class in every English class and it increases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always come to the English class at English class and it is still 5.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 69.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often come to the English class and it decreases to become 52.7% at post-questionnaire. And in control class 63.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often come to the English class and decreases to become 50% at post-questionnaire

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes come to the English class and increases to become 41.6% at post-

questionnaire. In control class 30.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes come to the class and it increases to become 44.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom come to the English class and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 0% of the respondents seldom come to the English class in pre-questionnaire and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never come to the English class and still 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never come to the English class and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.2**Students' Discipline when entering the class****THE STUDENTS COME TO THE ENGLISH CLASS ON TIME**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	2	5.5%	5	13.8%	1	2.7%	3	8.3%
2	Often	3	8.3%	4	11.1%	2	5.5%	3	8.3%
3	Sometimes	19	52.7%	23	63.8%	20	55.5%	20	55.5%
4	Seldom	11	30.5%	4	11.1%	12	33.3%	10	27.7%
5	Never	1	2.7%	0	0%	1	2.7%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always come on time to the class in every English class and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always come on time to the English class at English class and it increases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 8.33% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often come on time to the English class and it increases to become 11.1% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often come on time to the English class and it increases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 52.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes come on time to the English class and increases to become 63.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 55.5% the respondents in pre-questionnaire are sometimes come on time to the class and it is still 55.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 30.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom come on time to the English class and it decreases to become 11.1% at post-questionnaire. In control class 33.3% of the respondents are seldom come on time to the English class in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never come on time to the English class and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never come on time to the English class and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.3

Students' activity during teaching and learning process

**THE STUDENTS DO NOT GO OUT FROM THE CLASS DURING
LEARNING ENGLISH**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0%	3	8.3%	1	2.7%	3	8.3%
2	Often	2	5.5%	5	13.8%	3	8.3%	2	5.5%
3	Sometimes	26	72.2%	21	58.3%	27	75%	26	72.2%
4	Seldom	8	22.2%	7	19.4%	5	13.8%	5	13.8%
5	Never	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always does not go out from the class during teaching and learning English and it increases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always do not go from the class during teaching and learning English and it increases to become 8.3% at -questionnaire.

In experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often do not go out from the class during teaching and learning English and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of the respondents in

pre-questionnaire often from the class during teaching and learning English and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 72.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes do not go out from the class during teaching and learning English and it decreases to become 58.33% at post-questionnaire. In control class 75% of the respondents in pre test sometimes do not go out from the class during teaching and learning English and it decreases to become 72.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom do not go out from the class during teaching and learning English and it decreases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 13.8% of the respondents seldom do not go out from the class during teaching and learning English in pre-questionnaire and it is still 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never do not go out from the class during teaching and learning English and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never do not go out from the class during teaching and learning English and still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.4**Students' attitude in learning English****THE STUDENTS COME TO LEARN ENGLISH SERIOUSLY**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	3	8.3%	6	16.6%	3	8.3%	4	11.1%
2	Often	9	25%	14	38.8%	8	22.2%	8	22.2%
3	Sometimes	16	44.4%	15	41.6%	13	36.1%	14	38.8%
4	Seldom	8	22.2%	1	2.7%	12	33.3%	10	27.7%
5	Never	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always come to learn English seriously and it increases to become 16.6% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always come to learn English seriously and it increases to become 11.1% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 25% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often come to learn English seriously and it increases to become 38.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often come to learn English seriously and it is still 22.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 44.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes come to learn English seriously and it decreases to become 41.6% at

post-questionnaire. In control class 36.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes come to learn English seriously and it is still 38.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom come to learn English seriously and it decreases to become 2.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 33.3% of the respondents seldom come to learn English seriously in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never come to learn English seriously and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never come to learn English seriously and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.5

Students' purpose in visiting school library

**THE STUDENTS GO TO THE SCHOOL LIBRARY FOR READING THE
ENGLISH BOOK**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	3	8.3%	5	13.8%	3	8.3%	2	5.5%
2	Often	8	22.2%	15	41.6%	7	19.4%	7	19.4%
3	Sometimes	16	44.4%	11	30.5%	18	50%	16	44.4%
4	Seldom	9	25%	5	13.8%	8	22.2%	11	30.5%
5	Never	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always go to the School Library for reading the English book and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always go to the School Library for reading the English book and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often go to the School Library for reading the English book and it increases to become 41.6% at post-questionnaire. In control class 19.4% of respondents in pre-

questionnaire often go to the School Library for reading the English book and it is still 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 44.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes go to the School Library for reading the English book and it decreases to become 30.55% at post-questionnaire. In control class 50% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes go to the School Library for reading the English book and still 44.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 25% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom go to the School Library for reading the English book and it decreases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 22.2% of the respondents seldom go to the School Library for reading the English book in pre-questionnaire and it increases to become 30.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never go to the School Library for reading the English book and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never go to the School Library for reading the English book and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.6

Students' purpose in visiting public Library

**THE STUDENTS GO TO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR READING THE
ENGLISH BOOK**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENT CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	3	8.3%	5	13.8%	4	11.1%	7	19.4%
2	Often	5	13.8%	7	19.4%	4	11.1%	4	11.1%
3	Sometimes	16	44.4%	21	58.3%	16	44.4%	18	50%
4	Seldom	10	27.7%	2	5.5%	9	25%	5	13.8%
5	Never	2	5.5%	1	2.7%	3	8.3%	2	5.5%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always go to Public Library for reading the English book and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 11.1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always go to Public Library for reading the English book and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often go to Public Library for reading the English book and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 11.1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often go to Public Library for reading the English book and it is still 11.1% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 44.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes go to Public Library for reading the English book and it increases to become 58.3% at post-questionnaire. In control class 44.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes go to Public Library for reading the English book and it increases to become 50% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 27.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom go to Public Library for reading the English book and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 25% of the respondents seldom go to Public Library for reading the English book in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never go to Public Library for reading the English book and it decreases to become 2.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never go to Public Library for reading the English book and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.7

Students' activity when they have a leisure time

**THE STUDENTS READ THE ENGLISH BOOK WHEN THE CLASS IS
BREAK**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	2	5.5%	7	19.4%	2	5.5%	5	13.8%
2	Often	7	19.4%	6	16.6%	8	22.2%	5	13.8%
3	Sometimes	15	41.6%	18	50%	15	41.6%	16	44.4%
4	Seldom	8	22.2%	3	8.3%	7	19.4%	5	13.8%
5	Never	4	11.1%	2	5.5%	4	11.1%	5	13.8%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always read English book when the class is break and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always read English book when the class is break and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 19.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often read English book when the class is break and it decreases to become 16.6% at post-questionnaire. In control class 22.2% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often read English book when the class is break and it decreases to become 13.8% at -questionnaire.

In experiment class 41.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes read English book when the class is break and it increases to become 50% at -questionnaire. In control class 41.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes read English book when the class is break and it increases to become 44.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom read English book when the class is break and it decreases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire. In control class 19.4% of the respondents seldom read English book when the class is break in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 13.8% at -questionnaire.

In experiment class 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never read English book when the class is break and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never read English book when the class is break and it increases to become 13.8% at -questionnaire.

TableIV.8**Students' activity if they have a leisure time****THE STUDENTS READ ENGLISH BOOK WHEN THEY ARE IN THE HOUSE**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	3	8.3%	9	25%	2	5.5%	8	22.2%
2	Often	2	5.5%	8	22.2%	4	11.1%	5	13.8%
3	Sometimes	20	55.5%	14	38.8%	19	52.7%	13	36.1%
4	Seldom	4	11.1%	4	11.1%	5	13.8%	5	13.8%
5	Never	7	19.4%	1	2.7%	6	16.6%	5	13.8%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 8.33% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always read the English book when they are in the house and it increases to become 25% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always read the English book when they are in the house and it increases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often read the English book when they are in the house and it increases to become 22.2% at - questionnaire. In control class 11.1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often read the English book when they are in the house and it increases become 13.8% at -questionnaire.

In experiment class 55.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes read the English book when they are in the house and it decreases to become 38.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 52.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes read the English book when they are in the house and it decreases to become 36.1% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom read the English book when they are in the house and it is still 11.1% at post-questionnaire. In control class 13.8% of the respondents seldom read the English book when they are in the house and it is still 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 19.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never read the English book when they are in the house and it decreases to become 2.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 16.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never read the English book when they are in the house and it decreases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.9

Students' attitude in the class

**THE STUDENTS ASK THE TEACHER WHEN THEY DO NOT
UNDERSTAND THE READING MATERIAL**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.7%	5	13.8%	1	2.7%	1	2.7%
2	Often	3	8.3%	8	22.2%	2	5.5%	3	8.3%
3	Sometimes	21	58.3%	16	44.4%	17	47.2%	17	47.2%
4	Seldom	6	16.6%	3	8.33%	8	22.2%	8	22.2%
5	Never	5	13.8%	4	11.1%	8	22.2%	7	19.4%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it is still 2.7% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it increases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of respondents in pre-

questionnaire often ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it increases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 58.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it decreases to become 44.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 47.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it is still 47.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 16.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire are seldom ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it decreases to become 8.33% at post-questionnaire. In control class 22.2% of the respondents seldom ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material in pre-questionnaire and it is still 22.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never ask to the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it decreases to become 11.1% at post-questionnaire. In control class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never ask the teacher when they do not understand the reading material and it decreases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.10

Students' effort in using Dictionary

**THE STUDENTS USE THE DICTIONARY IF THEY FIND THE
DIFFICULT WORDS**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.7%	2	5.5%	1	2.7%	1	2.7%
2	Often	2	5.5%	7	19.4%	2	5.5%	3	8.3%
3	Sometimes	20	55.5%	24	66.6%	23	63.8%	23	63.8%
4	Seldom	8	22.2%	1	2.7%	9	25%	7	19.4%
5	Never	5	13.8%	2	5.5%	1	2.7%	2	5.5%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it increases become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of respondents in pre test always use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it is still 2.7% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it increases become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 55.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it increases to become 66.6% at post-questionnaire. In control class 63.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it is still 63.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it decreases to become 2.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 25% of the respondents seldom use the dictionary if they find the difficult words in pre-questionnaire and it decreases become 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never use the dictionary if they find the difficult words and it increases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.11

Students' attention in the class

**THE STUDENTS READ THE GIVEN READING MATERIAL IN THE
CLASS WELL**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	3	8.3%	5	13.8%	3	8.3%	4	11.1%
2	Often	10	27.7%	12	33.3%	9	25%	11	30.5%
3	Sometimes	15	41.6%	17	47.2%	17	47.2%	14	38.8%
4	Seldom	8	22.2%	2	5.5%	7	19.4%	7	19.4%
5	Never	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always read the given reading material in the class well and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always read the given reading material in the class well and it increases to become 11.1% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 27.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often read the given reading material in the class well and it increases to become 33.3% at post-questionnaire. In control class 25% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often read the given reading material in the class well and it increases to become 30.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 41.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes read the given reading material in the class well and it increases to become 47.2% at -questionnaire. In control class, 47.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes read the given reading material in the class well and it decreases to become 38.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom read the given reading material in the class well and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 19.4% of the respondents seldom read the given reading material in the class well in pre-questionnaire and it is still 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never read the given reading material in the class well and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never read the given reading material in the class well and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.12

Students' attention when the teacher explains the reading material

**THE STUDENTS PAY ATTENTION WHEN THE TEACHER EXPLAINS
THE READING MATERIAL**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.7%	5	13.8%	2	5.5%	5	13.8%
2	Often	5	13.8%	11	30.5%	4	11.1%	8	22.2%
3	Sometimes	17	47.2%	13	36.1%	15	41.6%	12	33.3%
4	Seldom	12	33.3%	7	19.4%	14	38.8%	11	30.5%
5	Never	1	2.7%	0	0%	1	2.7%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it decreases to become 30.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 11.1% of respondents in pre-

questionnaire often pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it increases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class, 47.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it decreases to become 36.1% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 41.6% of the respondents in pre -questionnaire sometimes pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it decreases to become 33.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class, 33.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it decreases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 38.8% of the respondents seldom pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material in pre test and it decreases to become 30.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class, 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire are never pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never pay attention when the teacher explain the reading material and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.13**Students' interest to English lesson book****THE STUDENTS LIKE TO READ THE ENGLISH LESSON BOOKS**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0%	2	5.5%	1	2.7%	2	5.5%
2	Often	4	11.1%	10	27.7%	5	13.8%	7	19.4%
3	Sometimes	20	55.5%	19	52.7%	17	47.2%	15	41.6%
4	Seldom	12	33.3%	5	13.8%	13	36.1%	12	33.3%
5	Never	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read the English Lesson books and it increases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read the English Lesson books and it increases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read the English Lesson books and it increases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read the English Lesson books and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 55.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read the English Lesson books and it decreases to become 52.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 47.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read the English Lesson books and it decreases to become 41.6% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 33.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom like to read the English Lesson books and it decreases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 36.1% of the respondents seldom like to read the English Lesson books in pre-questionnaire and it decreases become 33.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read the English Lesson books and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read the English Lesson books and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.14**Students' interest to English story books****THE STUDENTS LIKE TO READ THE ENGLISH STORY BOOKS**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.7%	5	13.8%	2	5.5%	4	11.1%
2	Often	2	5.5%	9	25%	3	8.3%	5	13.8%
3	Sometimes	21	58.3%	18	50%	17	47.2%	15	41.6%
4	Seldom	8	22.2%	3	8.3%	9	25%	9	25%
5	Never	4	11.1%	1	2.7%	5	13.8%	3	8.3%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read English story books and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read English story books and it increases become 11.1% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read English story books and it increases to become 25% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read English story books and it increases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 58.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read English story books and it decreases to become 50% at

post-questionnaire. In control class 47.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read English story books and it decreases to become 41.6% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom like to read English story books and it decreases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire. In control class 25% of the respondents seldom like to read English story books in pre-questionnaire and it is still 25% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read English story books and it decreases to become 2.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read English story books and it decreases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.15**Students' interest to English articles****THE STUDENTS LIKE TO READ THE ENGLISH ARTICLES**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	2	5.5%	10	27.7%	2	5.5%	3	8.3%
2	Often	4	11.1%	10	27.7%	5	13.8%	7	19.4%
3	Sometimes	12	33.3%	10	27.7%	10	27.7%	8	22.2%
4	Seldom	10	27.7%	5	13.8%	9	25%	9	25%
5	Never	8	22.2%	1	2.7%	10	27.7%	9	25%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read the English articles and it increases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read the English articles and it increases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read the English articles and it increases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 13.8% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read the English articles and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 33.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read the English articles and it decreases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 27.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read the English articles and it decreases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 27.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom like to read the English articles and it decreases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 25% of the respondents seldom like to read the English articles in pre-questionnaire and it is still 25% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read the English articles and it decreases to become 2.7% at post-questionnaire. In control class 27.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read the English articles and it decreases to become 25% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.16

Students' interest to English newspapers

THE STUDENTS LIKE TO READ THE ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.7%	2	5.5%	1	2.7%	3	8.3%
2	Often	6	16.6%	11	30.5%	5	13.8%	5	13.8%
3	Sometimes	14	38.8%	13	36.1%	15	41.6%	16	44.4%
4	Seldom	10	27.7%	8	22.2%	9	25%	9	25%
5	Never	5	13.8%	2	5.5%	6	16.6%	3	8.3%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read the English newspapers and it increases become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 2.7% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always like to read the English newspapers and it increases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 16.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read the English newspapers and it increases to become 30.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often like to read the English newspapers and it is still 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 38.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read the English newspapers and it decreases to become 36.1%

at post-questionnaire. In control class 41.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes like to read the English newspapers and it increases to become 44.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 27.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom like to read the English newspapers and it decreases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire. In control class 25% of the respondents seldom like to read the English newspapers in pre-questionnaire and it is still 25% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read the English newspapers and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 16.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never like to read the English newspapers and it decreases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.17

Students' honestly in doing exercise

**THE STUDENTS DO THEIR EXERCISE BY THEM SELVES AND DO
NOT CHEAT THEIR FRIENDS**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	1	2.7%	7	19.4%	2	5.5%	6	16.6%
2	Often	6	16.6%	6	16.6%	4	11.1%	7	19.4%
3	Sometimes	24	66.6%	20	55.5%	23	63.8%	18	50%
4	Seldom	5	13.8%	3	8.3%	7	19.4%	5	13.8%
5	Never	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 5.5% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it increases to become 16.6% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 16.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it is still 16.6% at post-questionnaire. In control class 11.1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire

often do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 66.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it decreases to become 55.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 63.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it decreases to become 50% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 13.8% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it decreases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire. In control class 19.4% of the respondents seldom do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 13.8% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never do their exercise by themselves and do not cheat their friends and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.18**Students' effort in doing exercise****THE STUDENTS FINISH THEIR ENGLISH EXERCISE IN THE CLASS**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	0	0%	3	8.3%	1	2.7%	6	16.6%
2	Often	3	8.3%	7	19.4%	4	11.1%	6	16.6%
3	Sometimes	24	66.6%	24	66.6%	22	61.1%	16	44.4%
4	Seldom	8	22.2%	2	5.5%	9	25%	8	22.2%
5	Never	1	2.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always finishes their English exercise in the class and it increases to become 8.3% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 2.7% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always finish their English exercise in the class and it increases to become 16.6% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often finish their English exercise in the class and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 11.1% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often finish their English exercise in the class and it increases become 16.6% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 66.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes finish their English exercise in the class and it is still 66.6% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 61.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes finish their English exercise in the class and it decreases to become 44.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 22.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom finish their English exercise in the class and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class 25% of the respondents seldom finish their English exercise in their class in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never finish their English exercise in the class and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never finishes their English exercise in the class and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.19**Students' effort in doing their English homework****THE STUDENTS FINISH THEIR ENGLISH HOMEWORK**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	2	5.5%	5	13.8%	1	2.7%	9	25%
2	Often	4	11.1%	6	16.6%	3	8.3%	3	8.3%
3	Sometimes	22	61.1%	23	63.8%	24	66.6%	22	61.1%
4	Seldom	7	19.4%	2	5.5%	8	22.2%	2	5.5%
5	Never	1	2.7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire finish their English homework and it increases to become 13.8% at the end of the treatment. In control class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always finish their English homework in the class and it increases to become 25% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often finish their English homework and it increases to become 16.6% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of respondents in pre-questionnaire often finish their English homework and it is still 8.3% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 61.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes finish their English homework and it increases to become 63.8% at

post-questionnaire. In control class, 66.6% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes finish their English homework and it decreases to become 61.1% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 19.4% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom finish their English homework and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 22.2% of the respondents seldom finish their English homework in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 5.5% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never finish their English homework and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 0% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never finish their English homework and it is still 0% at post-questionnaire.

TableIV.20**Students' effort in finish their English exercise on time****THE STUDENTS FINISH THEIR ENGLISH EXERCISE ON TIME**

NO	ALTERNATIVE	EXPERIMENTAL CLASS				CONTROL CLASS			
		PRE		POST		PRE		POST	
		F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	Always	4	11.1%	8	22.2%	3	8.3%	8	22.2%
2	Often	2	5.5%	8	22.2%	3	8.3%	7	19.4%
3	Sometimes	17	47.2%	16	44.4%	17	47.2%	10	27.7%
4	Seldom	12	33.3%	4	11.1%	11	30.5%	10	27.7%
5	Never	1	2.7%	0	0%	2	5.5%	1	2.7%
TOTAL		36	100%	36	100%	36	100%	36	100%

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experiment and control class. It can be seen that in experiment class, 11.1% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire always finish their English exercise on time and it increases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of respondents in pre-questionnaire always finish their English exercise on time and it increases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often finish their English exercise on time and it increases to become 22.2% at post-questionnaire. In control class 8.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire often finish their English exercise on time and it increases to become 19.4% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 47.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes finish their English exercise on time and it decreases to become 44.4% at post-questionnaire. In control class 47.2% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire sometimes finish their English exercise on time and it decreases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 33.3% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire seldom finish their English exercise on time and it decreases to become 11.1% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 30.5% of the respondents seldom finish their English exercise on time in pre-questionnaire and it decreases to become 27.7% at post-questionnaire.

In experiment class 2.7% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never finish their English exercise on time and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire. In control class, 5.5% of the respondents in pre-questionnaire never finish their English exercise on time and it decreases to become 0% at post-questionnaire.

C. Data Analysis

1. The Student's reading interest score

From the formulation of the problem, there were three answers which must be found by the writer. To find out the findings, it is necessary to analyze and measure the data gained from the pre and post questionnaire before treatment. And post questionnaire was given after treatment. Below is the table of the classification of students' reading interest score.

Table IV.21

The Classification of Students' Reading Interest Score¹

NO	Categories	Score
1	Very Strong	81% - 100%
2	Strong	61% - 80%
3	Enough	41% - 60%
4	Low	21% - 40%
5	Very low	0% - 20%

In finding the percentage, the writer used the following formula:²

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\% \quad \text{Where: } P = \text{The Percentage}$$

F= The frequency

N= The total of score

¹ Riduwan. 2005. *Skala Pengukuran Variabel-variabel Penelitian*. Jakarta: Alfabeta. p.15

² Ibid.p.14

Table IV.22

**The Students' Reading Interest before using the Window Notes strategy on
Experimental class**

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	1	(2.7%)	25	(69.4)	8	(22.2%)	2	(5.5%)	0	(0%)
2	2	(5.5%)	3	(8.3%)	19	(52.7%)	11	(30.5%)	1	(2.7%)
3	0	(0%)	2	(5.5%)	26	(72.2%)	8	(22.2%)	0	(0%)
4	3	(8.3%)	9	(25%)	16	(44.4%)	8	(22.2%)	0	(0%)
5	3	(8.3%)	8	(22.2%)	16	(44.4%)	9	(25%)	0	(0%)
6	3	(8.3%)	5	(13.8%)	16	(44.4%)	10	(27.7%)	2	(5.5%)
7	2	(5.5%)	7	(19.4%)	15	(41.6%)	8	(22.2%)	4	(11.1%)
8	3	(8.3%)	2	(5.5%)	20	(55.5%)	4	(11.1%)	7	(19.4%)
9	1	(2.7%)	3	(8.3%)	21	(58.3%)	6	(16.6%)	5	(13.8%)
10	1	(2.7%)	2	(5.5%)	20	(55.5%)	8	(22.2%)	5	(13.8%)
11	3	(8.3%)	10	(27.7%)	15	(41.6%)	8	(22.2%)	0	(0%)
12	1	(2.7%)	5	(13.8%)	17	(47.2%)	12	(33.3%)	1	(2.7%)
13	0	(0%)	4	(11.1%)	20	(55.5%)	12	(33.3%)	0	(0%)
14	1	(2.7%)	2	(5.5%)	21	(58.3%)	8	(22.2%)	4	(11.1%)
15	2	(5.5%)	4	(11.1%)	12	(33.3%)	10	(27.7%)	8	(22.2%)
16	1	(2.7%)	6	(16.6%)	14	(38.8%)	10	(27.7%)	5	(13.8%)
17	1	(2.7%)	6	(16.6%)	24	(66.6%)	5	(13.8%)	0	(0%)
18	0	(0%)	3	(8.3%)	24	(66.6%)	8	(22.2%)	1	(2.7%)
19	2	(5.5%)	4	(11.1%)	22	(61.1%)	7	(19.4%)	1	(2.7%)
20	4	(11.1%)	2	(5.5%)	17	(47.2%)	12	(33.3%)	1	(2.7%)
Total	34		112		363		166		45	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as its percentage:

$$P = \frac{2084}{3600} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 57.9\%$$

From the percentage above, we can conclude, the students' reading interest before using the Window Notes strategy was Enough.

Table IV.23

**The Students' Reading Interest after using the Window Notes strategy on
Experimental Class**

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	2	(5.5%)	19	(52.7%)	15	(41.6%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)
2	5	(13.8%)	4	(11.1%)	23	(63.8%)	4	(11.1%)	0	(0%)
3	3	(8.3%)	5	(13.8%)	21	(58.3%)	7	(19.4%)	0	(0%)
4	6	(16.6%)	14	(38.8%)	15	(41.6%)	1	(2.7%)	0	(0%)
5	5	(13.8%)	15	(41.6%)	11	(30.5%)	5	(13.8%)	0	(0%)
6	5	(13.8%)	7	(19.4%)	21	(58.3%)	2	(5.5%)	1	(2.7%)
7	7	(19.4%)	6	(16.6%)	18	(50%)	3	(8.3%)	2	(5.5%)
8	9	(25%)	8	(22.2%)	14	(38.8%)	4	(11.1%)	1	(2.7%)
9	5	(13.8%)	8	(22.2%)	11	(30.5%)	3	(8.3%)	4	(11.1%)
10	2	(5.5%)	7	(19.4%)	24	(66.6%)	1	(2.7%)	2	(5.5%)
11	5	(13.8%)	12	(33.3%)	17	(47.2%)	2	(5.5%)	0	(0%)
12	5	(13.8%)	11	(30.5%)	13	(36.1%)	7	(19.4%)	0	(0%)
13	2	(5.5%)	10	(27.7%)	19	(52.7%)	5	(13.8%)	0	(0%)
14	5	(13.8%)	9	(25%)	18	(50%)	3	(8.3%)	1	(2.7%)
15	10	(27.7%)	10	(27.7%)	10	(27.7%)	5	(13.8%)	1	(2.7%)
16	2	(5.5%)	11	(30.5%)	13	(36.1%)	8	(22.2%)	2	(5.5%)
17	7	(19.4%)	6	(16.6%)	20	(55.5%)	3	(8.3%)	0	(0%)
18	3	(8.3%)	7	(19.4%)	24	(66.6%)	2	(5.5%)	0	(0%)
19	5	(13.8%)	6	(16.6%)	23	(63.8%)	2	(5.5%)	0	(0%)
20	8	(22.2%)	8	(22.2%)	16	(44.4%)	4	(11.1%)	0	(0%)
Total	101		183		351		71		14	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as its percentage:

$$P = \frac{2446}{3600} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 67.9\%$$

From the percentage above, we can conclude, the students' reading interest after using the Window Notes strategy was Strong.

Table IV.24**The Students' Reading Interest in Pre Questionnaire on Control class**

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	2	(5.5%)	23	(63.8%)	11	(30.5%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)
2	1	(2.7%)	2	(5.5%)	20	(55.5%)	12	(33.3%)	1	(2.7%)
3	1	(2.7%)	3	(8.3%)	27	(75%)	5	(13.8%)	0	(0%)
4	3	(8.3%)	8	(22.2%)	13	(36.1%)	12	(33.3%)	0	(0%)
5	3	(8.3%)	7	(19.4%)	18	(50%)	8	(22.2%)	0	(0%)
6	4	(11.1%)	4	(11.1%)	16	(44.4%)	9	(25%)	3	(8.3%)
7	2	(5.5%)	8	(22.2%)	15	(41.6%)	7	(19.4%)	4	(11.1%)
8	2	(5.5%)	4	(11.1%)	19	(52.7%)	5	(13.8%)	6	(16.6%)
9	1	(2.7%)	2	(5.5%)	17	(47.2%)	8	(22.2%)	8	(22.2%)
10	1	(2.7%)	2	(5.5%)	23	(63.8%)	9	(25%)	1	(2.7%)
11	3	(8.3%)	9	(25%)	17	(47.2%)	7	(19.4%)	0	(0%)
12	2	(5.5%)	4	(11.1%)	15	(41.6%)	14	(38.8%)	1	(2.7%)
13	1	(2.7%)	5	(13.8%)	17	(47.2%)	13	(30.5%)	0	(0%)
14	2	(5.5%)	3	(8.3%)	17	(47.2%)	9	(25%)	5	(13.8%)
15	2	(5.5%)	5	(13.8%)	10	(27.7%)	9	(25%)	10	(27.7%)
16	1	(2.7%)	5	(13.8%)	15	(41.6%)	9	(25%)	6	(16.6%)
17	2	(5.5%)	4	(11.1%)	23	(63.8%)	7	(19.4%)	0	(0%)
18	1	(2.7%)	4	(11.1%)	22	(61.1%)	9	(25%)	0	(0%)
19	1	(2.7%)	3	(8.3%)	24	(66.6%)	8	(22.2%)	0	(0%)
20	3	(8.3%)	3	(8.3%)	17	(47.2%)	11	(30.5%)	2	
Total	38		108		356		171		47	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following

$$P = \frac{2079}{360} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 57.7\%$$

From the percentage above, we can conclude, the students' reading interest before using the Window Notes strategy was Enough.

Table IV.25

The Students' Reading Interest in Post-Questionnaire on Control class

No	Always		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
1	2	(5.5%)	18	(50%)	16	(44.4%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)
2	3	(8.3%)	3	(8.3%)	20	(55.5%)	10	(27.7%)	0	(0%)
3	3	(8.3%)	2	(5.5%)	26	(72.2%)	5	(13.8%)	0	(0%)
4	4	(11.1%)	8	(22.2%)	14	(38.8%)	10	(27.7%)	0	(0%)
5	2	(5.5%)	7	(19.4%)	16	(44.4%)	11	(30.5%)	0	(0%)
6	7	(19.4%)	4	(11.1%)	18	(50%)	5	(13.8%)	2	(5.5%)
7	5	(13.8%)	5	(13.8%)	16	(44.4%)	5	(13.8%)	5	(13.8%)
8	8	(22.2%)	5	(13.8%)	13	(36.1%)	5	(13.8%)	5	(13.8%)
9	1	(2.7%)	3	(8.3%)	17	(47.2%)	8	(22.2%)	7	(19.4%)
10	1	(2.7%)	3	(8.3%)	23	(63.8%)	7	(19.4%)	2	(5.5%)
11	4	(11.1%)	11	(30.5%)	14	(38.8%)	7	(19.4%)	0	(0%)
12	5	(13.8%)	8	(22.2%)	12	(33.3%)	11	(30.5%)	0	(0%)
13	2	(5.5%)	7	(19.4%)	15	(41.6%)	12	(33.3%)	0	(0%)
14	4	(11.1%)	5	(13.8%)	15	(41.6%)	9	(25%)	3	(8.3%)
15	3	(8.3%)	7	(19.4%)	8	(22.2%)	9	(25%)	9	(25%)
16	3	(8.3%)	5	(13.8%)	16	(44.4%)	9	(25%)	3	(8.3%)
17	6	(16.6%)	7	(19.4%)	18	(50%)	5	(13.8%)	0	(0%)
18	6	(16.6%)	6	(16.6%)	16	(44.4%)	8	(22.2%)	0	(0%)
19	9	(25%)	3	(8.3%)	22	(61.1%)	2	(5.5%)	0	(0%)
20	8	(22.2%)	7	(19.4%)	10	(27.7%)	10	(27.7%)	1	(2.7%)
Total	86		124		339		148		47	

From the table above, the obtained data were then computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as its percentage:

$$P = \frac{2276}{3600} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 63.2\%$$

From the percentage above, we can conclude, the students' reading interest after using the Window Notes strategy was Strong.

Table IV.26**The Students' Reading Interest Score in Experimental and Control class**

STUDENTS	EXPERIMENT		GAIN	STUDENTS	CONTROL		GAIN
	PRE	POST			PRE	POST	
Student 1	54	71	17	Student 1	54	70	1
Student 2	62	76	14	Student 2	60	75	1
Student 3	65	75	10	Student 3	63	74	1
Student 4	67	68	1	Student 4	52	68	1
Student 5	65	73	8	Student 5	59	72	6
Student 6	61	68	7	Student 6	63	67	2
Student 7	57	69	12	Student 7	52	68	2
Student 8	58	71	13	Student 8	54	70	4
Student 9	56	70	14	Student 9	56	68	5
Student 10	51	64	13	Student 10	53	64	2
Student 11	54	66	12	Student 11	54	65	3
Student 12	55	72	17	Student 12	54	70	5
Student 13	56	65	9	Student 13	57	63	3
Student 14	58	68	10	Student 14	60	66	6
Student 15	60	70	10	Student 15	64	68	11
Student 16	56	59	3	Student 16	58	59	1
Student 17	55	61	6	Student 17	60	60	8
Student 18	59	68	9	Student 18	60	66	0
Student 19	59	69	10	Student 19	56	67	3
Student 20	60	70	10	Student 20	62	68	5
Student 21	61	70	9	Student 21	62	72	10
Student 22	58	66	8	Student 22	56	64	1
Student 23	58	68	10	Student 23	60	66	0
Student 24	62	67	5	Student 24	61	65	0
Student 25	59	65	6	Student 25	65	63	0
Student 26	63	68	5	Student 26	68	66	14
Student 27	60	71	11	Student 27	66	66	0
Student 28	55	65	10	Student 28	63	63	8
Student 29	60	68	8	Student 29	65	66	16
Student 30	61	69	8	Student 30	64	67	0
Student 31	52	57	5	Student 31	56	72	16
Student 32	53	69	16	Student 32	53	55	2
Student 33	53	65	12	Student 33	51	57	6
Student 34	52	58	6	Student 34	51	52	1
Student 35	62	70	8	Student 35	54	56	2
Student 36	55	67	12	Student 36	51	53	2
TOTAL	2092	2436	344	TOTAL	2097	2309	148
MEAN	58.1	67.7	9.5	MEAN	58.2	64.1	4

From the calculation above, it is clear that the students' reading interest in experimental class is higher than students' reading interest in control class. It is shown by the calculation $67.7 > 64.1$

2. Data Analysis of Regression Formula

Table IV.27

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Post experiment	67.7	3.758	36
Postcontrol	64.1	4.217	36

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the total students' from each class, the experimental class consisted of 36 students and while for the control class consisted of 36 students too. The mean of Experimental class improvement was 67.1, and mean of control class improvement was 64.1. Standard deviation for experimental class was 3.758, while standard deviation for control class was 4.217.

Table IV.28

Correlation

	Post-exp	Post-cont
Pearson Correlation Post-exp	1	0.574
Post-cont	0.574	1
Sig. (1-tailed)Post-exp	0.00	0.00
Post-cont	0.00	0.00
NPost-exp	36	36
Post-cont	36	36

From the Table above, The Correlation between post-experiment and post-control is 0.574. According to Hartono, the strenght of relationship for the coeffisient or $r = 0.574$ is moderate relationship.³

³Hartono. 2008. *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. p. 87

Table IV.29

Variable Entered/Removed

Model	Variables Entered	Variable Removed	Method
1	Post-Exp	0	Enter

a. All requested variables entered

b. Dependent Variable: Post-control

Table IV.30

Model Summary

Mode	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.752	0.572	0.551	3.346

R Square = 0.572 indicates the amount of relationship between Post-Experiment and Post-Control is about 57.2%.

Table IV.31

Anova^b

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	329.805	1	329.805	14.521	0.001
Residual	772.195	34	22.712		
Total	1102.000	35			

From the table above, it can be seen that $F_{\text{calculated}} = 14.521 > F_{0.05,1,70} = 4.00$ and $\alpha = 0.05 > \text{Sig } 0.001$. It can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. In other word, There is a significant effect of students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy of the second year students at State Junior High School 11 Dumai

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the explanations in chapter IV, finally the about the effect of using the Window Notes strategy toward reading interest of the second year students at state Junior High School 11 Dumai, consist to the conclusions as follows:

1. The Mean (M_x) of students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy is 67.7.
2. The Mean (M_y) of students' reading interest which is taught by using Conventional strategy is 64.1.
3. From the research findings, from analysis of regression formula. It can be seen that $F_{\text{calculated}} = 12.706 > F_{0.05,1,70} = 4.00$ and $0.05 > \text{Sig}$ 0.001. It can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted.

It shows that there is a significant effect of students' reading interest which is taught by using the Window Notes strategy of the second year students at State Junior High School 11 Dumai.

B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion of the research above, it is known that using the Window Notes strategy in teaching reading can affect students' reading interest.

So that, the Window Notes strategy is one of choices by English teacher in order to increase students' reading interest.

After concluding a research at State Junior High School 11 Dumai, the writer would like to propose some suggestion to make teaching and learning process at this school getting better than before. This suggestions as follows:

1. Writer suggests the teachers of English subject to use the Window Notes strategy in teaching and learning process because it can improve students' interest in Reading.
2. Writer suggeststhe teachers of English subject to use the Window Notes strategy in teaching and learning process because it can make students are creative in sharing their lives in the Window Notes shaped.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmadi, Abu.1987. *StrategiBelajarMengajar.Bandung*: PustakaSetia.
- Austin, Jennifer L. 2009. *The Effect of Guided Notes on Students' Responding and Accuracy*. Texas: University of Texas.
- Celce Murcia and Mariane. 1991. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Languages*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Creswell, W. John. 1991.*Educational Research:Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Merrill Prantice Hall.
- Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000.*Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application Sixth Edition*. USA: Prentice hall.
- Hartono. 2008. *StatistikuntukPenelitian*. Jogjakarta: PustakaPelajar.
- _____.2008.*SPSS 16.0 Analisis Data StatistikadanPenelitian*.Pekanbaru: PustakaPelajar.
- _____.2010.*MetodologiPenelitian*. Pekanbaru: Zanafala.
- Harvey F Silver, Richard W. Strong, and Matthew J. Parini.2007. *The Strategic Teacher*. Virginia: ASCD.
- _____.2007.*The Window Notes strategy*. Virginia: ASCD
- Hasibuan, Kalayo and M. FausanAnsyari.2007.*Teaching English as a Foreign language(TEFL)*.Pekanbaru:Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press.
- Hidi, Suzane.2008. *Educational Psychology Review*. New York:Springer.
- McWhorter, Kathleen.1992. *Efficient and Flexible Reading*. Niagara: Hoper Collong Publisher.
- MeiniArfida, S.Pd.Silabus SMPN 11 Dumai 2010-2011. (Dumai:Unpublished,2010)
- Mikulecky, Beatrice S.1996.*More Reading Power*. New York: Wesley publishing company.
- Nunan, David.2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. Sydney: McGraw Hill.

- Richard, Jack C.1992. *Longman Dictionary of Language and Applied Linguistics*. Malaysia: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Riduwan.2005. *SkalaPengukuranVariabel-VariabelPenelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- _____. 2011. *Minat Baca Siswa*. Bandung: Angkasa. p. 12
- Robinson, Daniel H.2009.*Increasing Text Comprehension and Graphic Note Taking Using a Partial Graphic Organizer*.Texas:University of Texas.
- Rupley, William H.1976. *The Reading Teacher*. New York:LawrenceElbraum.
- Savage, Alice and Patricia Mayer.2005. *Effective Academic Writing 2*. New York:Oxford University Press.
- Silvia, Paul J.2006. *Exploring the Psychology of Interest*. New York:Oxford University Press.
- SuharsimiArikunto.2006. *ProsedurPenelitian:SuatuPendekatanPraktik*. Jakarta: PT.AsdiMahasatya.
- _____. 2010. *DasardasarEvaluasiPenelitian*. Jakarta: BumiAksara.
- Syafii, M.2007. *From Paragraph to Research Report: A Writing of English for AcademicPurposes*. Pekanbaru:LBSI.
- Tampubolon, Prof.
Dr.1993.*MengembangkanMinatdanKebiasaanMembacapadaAnak*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Tuckman, Bruce W.1999. *Conducting Educational Research Fifth Edition*. New York: Harcourt Brace College Publisher.
- Ur, Penny.2003. *A course in Language Teaching:Practice and Theory*.USA: Cambridge University.